

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-93 have been subjected to a restriction requirement as follows:

Group I (Claims 1-28 and 55-89) drawn to a crosslinker and a composition thereof;

Group II (Claims 29-54) drawn to a method of making a crosslinker; and

Group III (Claims 90-93) drawn to a multilayer product.

Applicants affirm the election of Group I. For reasons detailed below, however, it is submitted that the claims of Group II should be rejoined into the present application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 15, 21, 24, 27, 28, 55-57, 61, 63, 74, 80, 83 and 85-87 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. More specifically, these claims allegedly use improper Markush language. Although Applicants disagree that the language used is indefinite, appropriate amendments have been made to overcome the rejection. Accordingly, these claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 3, 5-14, 16-20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 58-60, 62, 64-79, 81, 82, 84, 88 and 89 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; it is believed that the amendment described above also puts these claims in condition for allowance.

MPEP § 821.04 provides that "where product and process claims drawn to independent and distinct inventions are presented in the same application, applicant may be called upon under 35 USC § 121 to elect claims to either the product or process. . . . The claims to the nonelected invention will be withdrawn from further consideration under 35 CFR § 1.142. . . . However, if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined." In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants elected to prosecute Claims 1-28 and 55-89, directed to a product. Claims 29-54 are directed to a method of making that product, and include all of the recitals of, for example, Claim 1. For this reason, it is submitted that the claims of Group II are appropriate for rejoinder. Such action is respectfully requested.

U.S. Serial No. 09/918,983

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments made above overcome the outstanding rejections. In addition, it is submitted that the claims of Group II should be rejoined. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested and a notice of allowance directed to Claims 1-89 is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "DIANE R. MEYERS", is written over a horizontal line.

DIANE R. MEYERS

Registration No. 38,968

Attorney of Record

Telephone: (412) 434-2931

Facsimile: (412) 434-4292

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
January 28, 2004